Editorials by the Laity

Anglo-American Alliance England's Need. By Francis Grierson.

TWO things will force England and America into a coalition of material aims and interests—the menace of famine on one hand and the menace of the yellow races on the other. America can never hope to grapple with the yellow peril single handed; England can never hope to avoid starvation without a binding political agreement with the great republic. All other dangers seem insignificant compared with the laissez faire policy now in vogue in regard to this all important question. Unless England comes to a working understanding with the government and the people of the United States it would not be impossible for Germany to blockade her leading ports by means of airships, and that before long. In the political balance France and Spain will always be problematical.

In case of war France would soon be crippled by interior dissension and revolution. There has never been a political agreement based on material interests alone which has stood the test of a great crisis. Nothing founded on selfish interests will stand the onslaughts of change and the vicissitudes of national progress or disruption, and a commercial entente without a natural psychic attraction means nothing in the hour of political and social strain. France today would as soon join forces with Germany as bind her forces to any compact with Anglo-Saxon interests if the French people thought they were losing more, even a little more, than they were gaining. No one who has lived long in France can be deceived into believing that the deep animosity manifest by millions of the people against the old order of French patriotism may not be turned suddenly against all monarchical governments. Present day events and portents point to a socialistic president in France within a short time.

The time is gone when the great nations will go to war like schoolboys in a passion. There will be no passion in Germany's next war. It will be a war of cool calculation and cold blood. Englishmen who have not lived in Berlin do not understand the Prussian. Bismarck divorced the Prussian mind from sentimentality. The next war will be no dress parade show, but a simple affair of calculated famine. The maneuvers will be directed not against the head and the heart, but against the stomach.

Just after the Franco-Prussian war some French friends of mine described the conduct of the victorious Germans during the invasion. "The Prussians," said my friend, "fought with the coolness of human machines which nothing could stop. The French soldiers fought with a passion that soon cooled, the Germans with a cold blooded will that was crushing; when they made raids — private families in search of wines and provisions they did so with perfect politeness, but with pitiless determination."

But if the Prussian in 1870 was a fighting automaton with a will wound up like a clock, what would he be now after forty years of drill, and discipline far more reasoned, far more desperate, than any training ever conceived by the Spartans at their best or the Romans in their supremest triumphs?

The danger menacing England is not now a military but an aerial danger. The old Roman question of feeding the populace is revived once more. The English are an exception to almost every case presented in history. They are an island, and in their beautiful dreams of eternal prosperity, dreams which have lasted ever since the destruction of the Spanish armada, they have been hypnotised into a state of chronic lethargy, reduced to a condition of universal languor and semiconscious indifference. They are like men clutching at phantoms while avoiding realities.

The phantom just now to England is Germany, and no one seems able to see that the gravest danger lies not in anything military, but in the danger created by a distance of full three thousand miles of water; the danger of not having enough to eat. How is John Bull going to maintain the prestige of his proverbial corpulency?

At the first intimation of famine there would be a general rush for food. The farmer would soon cease to sell and begin to hide his provisions against the time of his own hunger; the people of the cities would rush for bread and flour; for the first time in England the proverb "bread is the staff of life" would suggest something hollow and sepulchral, for the thought of being surrounded on all sides by hostile fleets or airships would of itself paralyze the moral faculties of half the population of these islands.

The certain knowledge of the close proximity of battleships looming over the western horizon, intercepting, destroying, or delaying the merchant steamers arriving from America would appall the most courageous hearts. All would feel the crushing imminence of the new danger. Not a shopkeeper, not a butcher or baker, not a storekeeper, not a stockbroker or a banker, not a bishop in his palace or a lord in his castle, not a publican or a politician but would be made to realize the paralyzing effects of impending ruin. All bombast would cease.

Pride and prejudice would sink like a rotten log in the social quicksand. Nothing would remain as it was. The island known as England would appear like a ship parted from her moorings, gone from what seemed fixed and eternal. To draw an antithetical picture of what would happen to the highest and the lowest social grades in such an emergency we have but to scan the doomsday pages of Jerusalem, Rome, Carthage, and, above all, to contemplate the "wonders and terrors" of the French revolution. In every instance doom was achieved by hunger.

The two classes most steeped in apathy are the millionaires and titled rich on one hand and the irresponsible poor on the other. The first have many things to lose; the second, nothing but their lives, to which they would cling with frenzied tenacity. The rich live in mock security, thinking it an easy affair to escape in yachts, steamers, automobiles, etc. An attempt would be made to cross the water by night, but the danger on the water would be greater than the danger at home, and the first thing the government would do would be to put the people on short rations. Then all the available orators throughout the land would be set to work to talk to the people. The people! Alas, yes! For the people hate the pangs of hunger even more than the gouty member of parliament, so often advised by his physician to starve himself for a week or two as a cure for his aches and disorders.

The rich would find the first weeks of the blockade rather exciting and agreeable. But the man in the street would begin to growl on the first day famine cast her grim shadow across his path. On him, the hungry man with a family of starving children, sermons, speeches, and reasoned editorials would produce no effect. The government would be blamed, all political parties would be blamed, and the end of famine would be a pandemonium of drunkenness, frenzy, and destruction. The Paris commune would be repeated with this difference—the ruin wrought in London would be incalculably greater.

In the universal fury and confusion one party would blame the other, rage and dismay would seize on all, a chorus of curses and rituperation would arise to drown authority and urge the remnant on to national annihilation. Forty-eight hours of cumulative delirium and horror would wipe out a thousand years of accumulated civilizations.

United States, Preceptor of Japan. By Louis Ichige Ogata.

A VISITOR to Japan is at once impressed with the evident desire for education among the Japanese people that shows itself on every hand. The governmental regulation that makes education compulsory is really little needed, for the parents themselves show the greatest eagerness to give their children the best school advantages they can afford. In spite of the multitude of children who swarm the streets and the vast number who work in the fields and in various industries where the cheap labor of children can be used to advantage, school statistics in Japan show a much better percentage of children of school age in attendance than is shown in some states in America.

Recent reports show that there are about 30,000 public and private schools, nearly 120,000 professors and teachers, and about 5,295,000 students in Japan. There is hardly an incorporated city in the empire that has not at least one kindergarten. Many colleges and universities, public and private, furnish opportunity for higher learning to thousands of Japanese young men as well as women, but the crown of them all is the imperial university.

While having flourished in a narrow way in ancient Japan, the development of the modern system of education has come since the restoration of the imperial government in 1868. Admiral Perry's treaty previous to this time not only opened the door of Japan commercially, but also by opening the eyes of the Japanese people to western civilization and culture stirred the nation to "new life" educationally and intellectually. It was natural that Japan should look toward the United States for her educational ideas.

The United States made our nation a great debtor in educational matters when she remitted her share, $150,000, of an indemnity of $300,000 which Japan had to pay to certain powers for what is known as the Shimonasaki affair. By specific provisions of the act of congress this sum of $150,000 was to be devoted to education in Japan. This cemented a firm alliance in education, for which Japan has been a gainer and the United States not a loser.

In other direct ways the United States has had a hand in molding the Japanese educational system. At the first, leading American educators, after a study of the needs of the nation just emerging from its feudal condition, established standards of education in literature, science, and law; many teachers went to Japan personally to introduce these systems and to build up and superintend the educational interests of the empire.

As early as 1860, by the advice of Minister Harris, the first American minister to Japan, a large body of young men who were in training for government positions were sent by the shogun to the United States and to other countries to study, each in his own specialty, the best occidental methods for use in developing the "new Japan." Another similar group of young men was sent by the imperial government in 1872.

The young men thus trained have applied their learning to their country's needs. Many have risen to the highest posts. So far as they were adaptable, the ideas and methods in the government, commerce, and education of the great republic have been incorporated into the Japanese system.

In many other less direct ways the United States has influenced Japan. Christian missions and Christian schools have been powerful factors. Other schools, founded by Americans and English, or by Japanese educated in America as well as in European countries, scattered up and down the empire, have sent out young Japanese trained in American ways and imbued with American spirit, and have served as models on which the Japanese have builded institutions of their own.

As an instance of the influence of a Japanese who is a product of American missions and who has assimilated the best in the American systems of education, President Naruse of the women's university of Tokio typifies the far-reaching extent of the evangelical missions. He served as a minister for many years, and though he met with slight encouragement, finally determined to establish an institution that would give the women of the empire the same opportunities as were enjoyed by the men.

He made an extensive trip to the United States, studying the principles of education, especially as applied to women, and their place in the American schools and colleges. He returned to Japan with definite hopes and planned gradually, in spite of discouragement, to build up a flourishing women's university.

The school he founded has extensive grounds in the suburbs of Tokio, with many large buildings, and a student body of nearly 1,300 young women. The professors are both Japanese and foreign, and are admirably fitted for the great work of educating the womanhood of Japan for the responsibilities in the nation's "new life," and of the all-permeating influence of American scholastic ideals.

In this way, directly and indirectly, the United States has given impetus to the development of an educational system to the rising generations of Japan; has trained, educated, and inspired many of Japan's leaders of thought and action in many fields, and has given a wide application to the spirit of brotherhood among nations.

Cooking Neglected Art in the Home. By Prof. H. Strauss.

"THE destinies of nations," says Brillat-Savarin, the gifted author of "Physiology of Taste," in one of his aphorisms, "are determined largely by the manner in which they are nourished."

While this saying goes somewhat too far it contains, nevertheless, a germ of truth. The matter of noruishment, of good or bad, careful or indifferent cooking, has a decided influence upon public health, and affects not only the physical but the mental well being of a nation.

Two things enter into a consideration of the question of nourishment: the proper choice of raw materials and the rational preparation of the same. This last is the important but rather neglected art of cooking.

The history of cooking is as old as civilization itself. It is one of the things which characterize man from the animal, and the more civilized man becomes the more care and attention he bestows upon the art of cooking. It was formerly believed that cooking had its beginning in the burnt-offerings which the heathen peoples brought to their gods. Recent discoveries, however, have proven that the art of cooking dates further back, into the stone ages. Thanks to the archæologists we have learned that the old Assyrians, for example, delighted in "bread and burnt meat." And from what we learn about the nourishment of the old Egyptians we can safely assume that the dried up mummies which we see in our museums have in their day enjoyed many delicious viands.

With the Greeks the art of cooking has taken a great leap forward. With their love of life and of pleasure it could not have been otherwise. They have shown their gift and symmetry not only in their architectural achievements and in their high stage of culture, but also in their kitchens. They brought the art of cooking to a high standard of perfection. As for Rome, it did not allow itself to be outdone by Greece.

Since the days of Rome and Greece the art of cooking has still further advanced. We have learned not only to cook well, to make our food tasty and appetizing, but to choose our food. We have even gone so far as to cure certain diseases and to prevent a great many more by the use of properly chosen and properly cooked food.

In spite of the progress which the art of cooking has made theoretically, cooking—the art of preparation of food—is still a rather negligible thing in most homes, of the rich as well as of the poor.

With few exceptions it is, of course, the woman who is supposed to be master of this art. It is therefore all the more to be regretted that our women, and especially the wealthy women, are getting more and more away from the kitchen and from the art of cooking. There are, of course, many reasons why wealthy women lose all interest in the art of cooking. The chief reason perhaps is the belief that there is nothing in this art to interest a cultured woman.

Many a young woman to whom cooking seems merely drudgery, a thing without thought or interest, would quickly change her mind if she were trained to look and see in the various procedures in cooking scientific processes. She would perhaps be surprised to note that, contrary to her accepted views, cooking demands a great deal of intelligence, and when this intelligence is bestowed upon it becomes an interesting art.

If the woman who abhors the kitchen would but once make an attempt to inquire into the history of cooking she would find that she is in good company. She would find that men like the Prince von Condé and Prince von Soubise found the art of cooking not at all an uninteresting study. She would find that statesmen like Richelieu, Mazarin, and Colbert, philosophers like Montaigne and Kant, and other great spirits did not think it below their dignity to occupy themselves with questions of the kitchen. Many kings of France and Frederick the Great of Germany were also ardent students of the art of cooking, so that our fashionable women would find themselves in distinguished company.

Among the poorer families the art of cooking is likewise neglected by the women. Many think that every occupation is superior to work in the kitchen. Many of the girls never get the opportunity to learn anything about the art of cooking, for as soon as they are out of school they enter some other occupation.

All told, therefore, the art of cooking fares badly in modern society. In spite of the theoretical advance which the subject has made, in spite of the attention which scientists of repute are bestowing upon it, our daughters are still "picking up" their knowledge of cooking from their mothers, which is the same knowledge which their mothers picked up from their grandmothers, and is certainly a hundred years behind the times.

About the only way, it seems, which can save us from this inexcusable neglect of the art of cooking is its compulsory instruction in the public schools, as it is already being done in Baden, Saxony, Hamburg, and in other German states and cities, and in some of the American schools.

Truth Absolute an Impossibility. By Ada May Krecker.

IT is said of Darwin that his books were the most revolutionary to scientific theory, the most illuminating to biologists, of any in their age, and that today none are so little quoted in the colleges. They are "creeds outworn, outgrown.

Yet they, more than any other one set of works, are credited with bringing biological ideas to their present position. They were new in the nineteenth century, advanced. In the twentieth century they are old, obsolete. Thus with all our knowledge. It is a fit in one age; a misfit in the next. Today it is revolutionary. Tomorrow it is reactionary.

And this for many reasons. As our race evolves it sees things differently. For it has more light to see with. In a totally dark room we know nothing of its furnishings. Let the starlight in and we see dim outlines of things; the moonlight, and we see more. Light a candle, a gas jet, an electric burner, and with each we see more clearly. The sunlight makes things still plainer. An X ray exposes to view even their interiors. Our descriptions of the room given at these successive stages of illumination would necessarily differ, and widely. Perhaps they would conflict. Nevertheless, each would hold true for the time and circumstances of its giving.

So it is with our ideas of the universe. They are true for the time being. But added light brings fresh revelations. We describe things differently from age to age. For we see them differently. But within its own sphere each theory is correct. Atoms are still indestructible within the limits of the sort of matter the nineteenth century physicists were talking about. It is only when the newly discovered radiant quality of matter is taken into account that they become destructible. This new found quality of matter is an added ray of light which obliges us to see the atom differently than before. But it does not alter the veridity of the old theory of indestructibility which is true within its own proper limits.

Also we are changing. The savage, the civilized man, the scientist, the poet would each have a different description of the room in its different degrees of light. As the race develops it passes from savagery to civilization, and from one degree of culture and intelligence to another. It begins with savage conceptions of things and ends with scientific and poetic. The knowledge of the savage is the ignorance of the scientist. And the wisdom of the scientist is the folly of the poet. The truth of today is the lie of tomorrow.

That which illuminates the seedling race is darkness to the racial sprout which has emerged above the ground. That which serves the sprout hampers the full grown tree.

The most daring conceptions of our most advanced thinkers, their most illuminating theories may seem primitive, puerile, silly to the coming race of ages hence.

An eternal fact, how unattainable! A temporary fact, how simple, how inevitable! Nothing is true forever. Everything is true for a time. Truth absolute is impossible. Truth relative is omnipresent. Everything is true somewhere, somehow, somewhen.

Among men are a myriad degrees of evolution. So there are a myriad phases of thought, a myriad forms of philosophy, of religion. Each serves the purposes of those to whom it appears as truth. And each is true within its own sphere of influence. Every man views things according to his own light. He finds it impossible to see them in any other way.

Yet as time and evolution go on all modify their ideas. The race as a whole passes from one stage of thought to another. And the individual who is a revolutionist, a reformer, a radical, a vanguard thinker in this incarnation may return to the world in his next incarnation as a reactionary, a conservative, a laggard. For during his absence the racial thought will have risen to another level.

Some twenty-first century Darwin will have come with a twenty-first century origin of species. Some twenty-second Gustave Le Bon will have written a twenty-second century theory on the dematerialization of matter. And our reincarnated wonder of the twentieth century still will be thinking in the terms of his 200 years ago.

The absolute truth is the relativity of truth. The eternal fact is the changefulness of facts. If our reincarnating man have apprehended these great verities in the tewentieth century he can live on earth when he will and find it comparatively easy to grasp the truth and the facts of his immediate era, discover that which is in harmony with the law of its development, that which furthers its growth.

Observing Things Worth Observing. By John A. Howland.

ONE of the most important qualifications in the worker, if he will, may be made to center around cultivated powers of observation, with attendant ability to make quick and accurate deductions from those things which he trains himself to observe.

In a general way it may be asserted that there are few things on the immediate horizon of the worker which do not affect him. Especially in the crowded life of the cities it is a necessity that the worker prepare to treat with a thousand tangible and intangible things which, while outside his own personality and life, nevertheless exert a tremendous influence upon him, year after year. To learn to observe and know the things that do affect him, and out of his experience to make the most of his observations in the serving of his ends is something worth the while of the young man who has his way to make in the world.

A few years ago a French scientist startled the world by the production of radium. Everywhere the world of science was stirred by the possibilities of the new discovery, but while speculation was at its height this man who had awakened to find himself famous so far forgot himself that he was run over and killed by a vehicle in the streets of Paris. With mind enough to center the attentions of the world in its discoveries, he had been incapable of crossing a crowded street and died in the attempt.

This incident by no means exaggerates a well recognized weakness of many great minds. Rather it has been characteristic of some of the world's greatest thinkers that, engrossed in thought, they have been deaf and blind to all outside influences. It has been unfortunate that this weakness of the minds of so many great thinkers has been looked upon as indicative of their strength. In their concentration of thought, losing their perspectives with reference to everything else, they have been little better than imbeciles in their contact with their fellows. To command sufficient concentration and yet keep in touch with those other necessary facts of life always must be the mark of the better brain.

How small may be the observation, yet of what magnitude of influence only the properly trained mind may determine. I once knew a man who through a mistaken idea of that which was worthy of observation and note ruined all his prospects in life. He never climbed a pair of stairs without counting the number of steps to the top. In the vanity of his close observation he never made an observation that was worth while. He became a hopeless pedant, pursued by the passion of making observations which find no practical bearing upon anything that most might have concerned him. To discover something about something which nobody else would have been interested enough to remark became a craze with him.

Training the mind to observation that shall be worth while at once is the opportunity and the necessity of the young man. Whatever the observation that is worth while not only will not be wasted but by its observance the mind is quickened to the next occasion and in line to profit by the experience.

"What is worth while observing?" would you ask. No one can answer the question for you literally and conclusively. This is the thing which must be determined by the judgment of the observer.

The other day I was walking briskly down the street just behind a young man wearing a new straw hat for which he had paid $3 or $4. It was worth my while to observe at the corner next ahead of us that a brisk wind was whipping past it, as easily was to be seen by the crowds milling there. But the young man failed to observe, stepped into the full and sudden force of the wind, which snapped the hat from his head and flung it under the wheels of a truck, which ground the hat to pieces. It would have been worth $3 or $4 to that young man to have observed only that one windy crossing and the way people were blown about there, right in front of his eyes, and made it especially stupid of him not to see.

How valuable the faculty of observation may be, even in minor things, is suggested often by the absurd position in which a person finds himself simply because he hasn't exercised that faculty. Nothing is more embarrassing than the accusation of stupidity and nothing lends itself more to stupidity than does the neglect to observe. It is only when observation would have spared embarrassment that the charge of stupidity rests against the blunderer.

But if lack of observation leads to embarrassment and difficulty, it is no less remarkable how intelligent observation of some of the slightest things leads the observer to the short, straight cut to his ends. In many of the relations of life it is necessary that one shall leave things to the observations of those with whom he comes in contact. The situation must be misunderstood if it becomes necessary baldly to call attention to it. Yet in just such circumstances to fail to observe brings a double burden of embarrassment to all concerned. How many times have you writhed in thought at remembrance of something you saw or heard which should have been your cue to avoid that one thing which of all others you stupidly failed to do?

All of us are familiar with that type of person who continually is "making breaks." He can be depended upon anywhere and at any time to do or say the characteristically wrong thing. Search for the cause of it and you will find it in his lack of powers of observation. And almost invariably he is the one worst sufferer for his lack of intuition. He is too palpably innocent to be suspected of intent by others, but continually he is upbraiding himself for fear that he has been misunderstood.

That point I would emphasize to the young man preparing for his life work is that only through training of the faculties to observations incidental to one's environment can the young man make the most of his opportunities. Otherwise he occupies the position of a man among his fellows, blindfold and in the dark.